REMARKS

Applicants will address each of the Examiner's objections and rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Election

In response to the Examiner's request, Applicants confirm their election to prosecute Group I: Claims 1-15 in the above-identified application. Applicants are making this election without disclaimer or prejudice to later filing a divisional application on the non-elected claims.

Claim Objections

The Examiner also objects to Claim 13 as being in improper multi-dependent form. In response, Applicants have amended Claim 13 to depend only on Claims 1 and 2. Hence, it is in proper form, and it is respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 1, 9-12, 14

The Examiner also rejects Claims 1, 9-12, 14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama (US 2001/0002703) in view of Himemisha et al. (JP 09-235546). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 1 to recite that the anode is

in contact with the first passivation film, and that the cathode is in contact with the second passivation film. This is shown, for example, in Fig. 3 of the present application (see also p. 7-8 of the specification). As explained in the present application (see e.g. page 6, lns. 2-8), the structure of the claimed invention is advantageous by sandwiching light-emitting elements between passivation films, which allows very little moisture and oxygen to be transferred. As a result, even if the concentration of the dopant is on the order of 0.001 to 0.1 % by weight, the deterioration of the dopant has very little influence on the characteristics of the light-emitting element, resulting in improved reliability of the light-emitting element.

In contrast, Koyama appears to disclose in Fig. 12, an anode 50 in contact with a leveling layer 42 and with a light-emitting layer 52. Further, a first passivation film 41 in Koyama appears to be located below the leveling layer 42 so as not to be in contact with the anode 50, unlike in the structure of independent Claim 1. As a result, since the leveling layer 42 in Koyama is formed from a resin film (para. [0234]), moisture and oxygen can easily penetrate into the light-emitting element. Hence, Koyama does not appear to disclose or suggest having a passivation film in contact with an anode and thereby preventing penetration of moisture and oxygen into the light-emitting element.

Himeshima also does not disclose or suggest such claimed features.

Hence, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the device of independent Claim 1 and those claims dependent thereon of the present application, and these claims are patentable thereover. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 9-12, 14

The Examiner also rejects Claims 2, 9-12, 14 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (US 2002/0070385) in view of Koyama and Himemisha et al. This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicants traverse this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicants are amending independent Claim 2 in a similar manner to that discussed above for independent Claim 1.

Hence, for at least the reasons discussed above for Claim 1, Claim 2 is also not disclosed or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, independent Claim 2 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over these references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3

The Examiner also rejects Claim 3 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatenable over Yamagata, Koyama and Himemisha et al. and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US Publ 2002/0074936). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 4

The Examiner also rejects Claim 4 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama and Himemisha et al. and further in view of Yamazaki et al. (US 6,359,320). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 5

The Examiner also rejects Claim 5 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata, Koyama and Himemisha et al. and further in view of Tamai et al. (US 5,793,497). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 6

The Examiner also rejects Claim 6 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himemisha et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himemisha et al. and further in view of *Producing Monolithic Light Emitting Diode Display Chips* (IBM Technical Disclosure Bulletin Vol. 16, Issue 1, Pg. 6, 6/1/1973). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 7

The Examiner also rejects Claim 7 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himemisha et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himemisha et al. and further in view of Jones et al. (US 6,069,443). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 8

The Examiner also rejects Claim 8 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himemisha et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himemisha et al. and further in view of Admission (Applicant's Admitted Prior Art). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 15

The Examiner also rejects Claim 15 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama and Himemisha et al. or Yamagata, Koyama and Himemisha et al. and further in view of Tamano et al. (US 5,968,675). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

This claim is a dependent claim. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above for the independent claims, this claim is also patentable over the cited references. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any further fee should be due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 13, 2005

Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer no. 000026568